

REPORT

on

STATE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AGENCIES

and

THE LAWS THEY ADMINISTER

Prepared by the
COMMISSION ON LAW AND SOCIAL ACTION
OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

15 East 84th Street

New York 28, N.Y.

6'957

Prepared by

Commission on Law and Social Action

Shad Polier, Chairman

Leo Pfeffer, Director

Will Maslow, General Counsel

American Jewish Congress

15 East 84 Street, New York 28, N.Y.

Israel Goldstein, President

Justine Wise Polier, Chairman
Executive Committee

Max A. Kopstein, Chairman
Administrative Committee

Isaac Toubin, Executive Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
General Summary	1
The Administrative Enforcement Process	2
Employment	3
Places of Public Accommodation	4
Education	5
Housing	5
Prohibited Conduct	6
The Case Load	7
The Cost to the People	8
The Population Affected	8
Appendices	10
I. State Anti-Discrimination Laws Establishing Administrative Agencies	10
II. State Anti-Discrimination Agencies	11
III. Salient Features of Laws With Enforcement Provisions	12
A. Who May Complain	12
B. Enforcement	12
C. Scope	13
D. Acts Banned	14
Notes to Appendix III	17
IV. Formal Complaints Received By Agencies With Enforcement Powers	19
V. Agency Budgets	20
VI. Proportion of Negro, Other Non-white, and Jewish Population	21

A REPORT ON
STATE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AGENCIES
AND THE LAWS THEY ADMINISTER

Thirteen states of the Union, containing 37% of the total population of the United States, have established specialized state agencies empowered to administer and enforce laws prohibiting one or more forms of discrimination based on race, religion or national origin. Two other states, with 4% of the population, have created anti-discrimination agencies without enforcement powers. This report summarizes the history of the establishment of these agencies, the scope of their powers and the nature of their operations.

General Summary

All of the thirteen states having enforceable laws prohibit discrimination in employment. In eight of these states, the agency enforcing the law against discrimination in employment is further authorized to prevent discrimination in places of public accommodation, such as hotels, restaurants, theatres and recreation areas. In four states, the anti-discrimination agency is directed to prevent discrimination by educational institutions. (A fifth entrusts this prohibition to the state education authorities.) In seven states, the anti-discrimination agency also deals with discrimination in public and publicly-assisted housing.

The thirteen state agencies having full enforcement powers have been given annual budgets totaling \$1,366,226. This amounts to 2.21 cents for each person in these states. Of the total number of Negroes, other non-whites and Jews in the United States, 17.09% of the Negroes, 27.27% of the other non-whites and 73.37% of the Jews lived in these states. The recent total annual case load of the agencies stands at 2003.

Attached to this study are six appendices. Appendix I lists the laws of the fifteen states that are described below. Appendix II lists the names and addresses of the anti-discrimination agencies in each of the states. Appendix III contains four charts showing the salient features of the laws administered by the thirteen state anti-discrimination agencies that have effective enforcement powers. Appendix IV shows the total number of formal complaints received during a twelve-month period by the eleven agencies that have had enforcement powers for more than a year. Appendix V shows the amount and the per capita cost of the budget of each of the fifteen state agencies covered by this report. Appendix VI shows the number and proportion of Negroes, other non-whites, and Jews in the population of each of the states.

The Administrative Enforcement Process

The first two anti-discrimination agencies were established in 1945, when New York and New Jersey adopted fair employment laws. The administrative procedure established by those laws has been followed in virtually all of the statutes described below.

The laws define certain prohibited acts as "unfair," "improper," or "illegal" practices. A person aggrieved by a violation of the law may complain to the state agency established by the the law, which then conducts an investigation. If the complaint appears to be well founded, the agency attempts to settle the matter by conciliation. If that fails, a formal hearing is held and the agency issues a decision either dismissing the complaint or directing the violator to comply with a detailed order. The agency's order can then be reviewed by a state court. If the court finds

that the agency's order is proper, it decrees compliance. Thereafter, violation of the order may be punished as contempt of court.

While all these agencies operate under this general administrative procedure, a few significant differences may be mentioned. The details appear in Tables A and B of Appendix III.

A proceeding may be initiated before any of the agencies by the filing of a complaint by a person who believes he has encountered discrimination. In addition, in eight of the states (all but Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York and Oregon), the Commission itself may initiate proceedings without waiting for an aggrieved party to act. Finally, in eight states (all but Connecticut, Michigan, Minnesota, Rhode Island and Washington), proceedings can be started by the state Attorney General or other public official.

In most of the states, no provision is made to allow a person who has filed a complaint to appeal to the courts if the agency decides that his complaint is without merit. In four states, however (Michigan, New Jersey, Rhode Island and Washington), such appeals are expressly allowed.

Employment

Table C of Appendix III shows the extent to which the thirteen agencies having enforcement powers deal with the areas of employment, education, public accommodations and housing. The history of the adoption of the laws in each of these areas may be described briefly.

As already noted, New York and New Jersey adopted the first fair employment laws in 1945. Additional fair employment laws were thereafter enacted in Massachusetts in 1946, Connecticut in 1947, New Mexico, Oregon,

Rhode Island and Washington in 1949, and Michigan, Minnesota and Pennsylvania in 1955.

"Voluntary" fair employment laws were adopted in 1945 by Indiana and Wisconsin. These laws condemned discrimination in employment without making it illegal. Each also established a state agency to attempt to bring about compliance. The Indiana law has never been strengthened to provide enforcement features. The Wisconsin law, however, was amended in 1957 to provide that orders of the agency administering the law could be enforced by appropriate court proceedings. Colorado adopted an extremely limited fair employment law in 1951 which, for the ordinary private employer, was in essence a "voluntary" law. It replaced that law in 1957 with a fully operative law modelled on those of the other states. In 1953, Kansas adopted a "voluntary" fair employment law and established a commission to attempt to bring about voluntary compliance.

Places of Public Accommodation

In 1949, a new trend was started in New Jersey. At that time New Jersey was one of a number of states having laws prohibiting discrimination in places of public accommodation. (Twenty-five states now have such laws, many of them having been in effect for fifty years or more.) The criminal and civil sanctions provided by these laws had proved relatively ineffective. Recognizing this, the New Jersey legislature decided to improve on the older procedure by applying the administrative process that had proven its merits under the 1945 fair employment law. Accordingly, it broadened the jurisdiction of its anti-discrimination agency to include public accommodations. The precedent thus set was

thereafter followed by Connecticut, also in 1949, Massachusetts in 1950, New York and Rhode Island in 1952, and Colorado, Oregon and Washington in 1957.

Education

In 1948, New York enacted a fair educational practices act, providing administrative procedures to prevent discrimination by colleges and universities. Enforcement was entrusted not to the existing anti-discrimination agency but to the Department of Education, where it remains today. In New Jersey, however, the 1949 law just mentioned, giving the anti-discrimination agency power to prevent discrimination in public accommodations, also brought under the act discrimination by educational institutions. Massachusetts, which adopted a fair educational practices act in 1949, transferred enforcement powers to its general anti-discrimination agency in 1956. Washington's 1957 law empowering its anti-discrimination agency to enforce the law against discrimination in public accommodations included educational institutions within the definition of that term. Also in 1957, Oregon gave its agency jurisdiction over its existing law prohibiting discrimination in trade, professional and vocational schools.

Housing

Seven anti-discrimination agencies have been given jurisdiction to enforce existing or new laws against discrimination in one or more category of public or publicly-assisted housing. The first such grant occurred in 1949 when the Connecticut agency received responsibility for

preventing discrimination in publicly-owned housing. Gradually, this and other state agencies were given jurisdiction over a number of categories of public and publicly-assisted housing so that, today, a total of seven agencies have such powers. Five of these, in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York and Rhode Island, have jurisdiction over public housing. The first four also have jurisdiction over redevelopment housing and other housing receiving substantial assistance from the government, for example, in the form of tax exemption and assembling of land through the power of condemnation. The Oregon agency has jurisdiction specifically over projects on land assembled by condemnation. Most important, six agencies, in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon and Washington, have jurisdiction over housing built with the assistance of loans guaranteed by the FHA, Veterans Administration or other government agency.

Prohibited Conduct

Table D of Appendix III shows in detail the kind of discriminatory conduct that the various statutes prohibit. It should be noted at the outset that all of the laws contain provisions recognizing the right of religious institutions to consider the factor of religion in their selections, whether of employees, students or others. This is done in a number of ways. In some laws, there is a broad exemption for non-profit enterprises. Others, while not exempting non-profit or religious institutions generally, provide that they may confine their selections to, or prefer, members of their own faith.

As Table D shows, all thirteen states having enforceable laws prohibit discrimination by employers and labor unions. Similar effective prohibitions of discrimination in education, public accommodation and publicly-assisted housing are contained in each of the acts that deal with these subjects.

Virtually all of the states prohibit both inquiries and advertising indicating an intent to engage in employment discrimination. Similar clauses appear in many of the laws prohibiting discrimination in education, public accommodations and publicly-assisted housing. The laws also contain a number of general provisions making it illegal to discriminate against those who participate in statutory proceedings, to aid or abet discrimination and to obstruct compliance with the law.

The Case Load

Appendix IV shows that the eleven agencies that have had effective enforcement powers for at least a year have carried an aggregate annual case-load of 2,003 formal complaints. On a population basis, this represents a little over three and a half complaints per 100,000 in the population. The figures range from .89 for Minnesota, which delegates some of its work to municipal commissions in the state, to 9.86 in Connecticut. The variation is due, to some extent, to the varying scope of the agencies' responsibilities. Some, like Minnesota, deal only with employment while others, like Connecticut, have broad powers over a number of areas. (See Appendix III, Table C.)

The Cost to the People

The budgets and per capita costs of the agencies in each of the fifteen states are set forth in Appendix V. In the thirteen states having enforceable laws, the current budgets total \$1,366,226 and the per capita annual cost to the 61,767,000 people in those states is 2.21 cents. The per capita cost varies greatly from state to state, ranging from 4.53 cents in Rhode Island to .25 cents in New Mexico. Like the complaint load figures just mentioned, this variation is partly due to differences in the agencies' responsibilities. Nevertheless, among agencies dealing only with employment, the range is from 1.84 cents in Michigan to .25 cents in New Mexico. Among agencies having had comprehensive powers for at least a year, the range is from 4.53 cents in Rhode Island to 1.81 in Massachusetts.

The Population Affected

Population figures for the fifteen states covered by this report appear in Appendix VI. The thirteen states having enforceable laws contain 37.39% of the total population of the United States, 17.09% of the Negroes and 27.27% of the other non-whites. There are no census figures for the Jewish population. Using widely accepted estimates, however, it appears that the Jews in these thirteen states constitute 73.37% of the total number of Jews in the country.

The successful operation of these laws over a period of twelve years is a convincing refutation of earlier fears that such legislation would

promote rather than allay intergroup differences. The laws and the work of the agencies they establish have resulted in substantial advances toward the democratic goal of full equality for all Americans, without regard to race, religion or national origin.

Joseph B. Robison
Herbert L. Chabot

December 10, 1957

APPENDIX I
STATE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LAWS
ESTABLISHING ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

<u>COLORADO</u>	<u>Emp.</u> Secs. 82-24-1 through 82-24-10, Colo. Rev. Stat. <u>Pub. Accom.</u> Secs. 24-3-1 through 24-3-8, Colo. Rev. Stat.
<u>CONNECTICUT</u>	<u>Emp.</u> -Ch. 371, Secs. 7400-7407, Conn. Gen. Stat. (1949), as amended by Secs. 3034d and 3035d, 1955 Supp. <u>Pub. Accom.</u> Ch. 417, Secs. 8374 and 8375, Conn. Gen. Stat. (1949), as amended by Secs. 3267d and 3268d, 1955 Supp.
<u>INDIANA</u>	Secs. 40-2301 through 40-2306, Ann. Ind. Stat. (Burns), 1957 Supp.
<u>KANSAS</u>	Secs. 44-1001 through 44-1008, Gen. Stat. Kan., 1955 Supp.
<u>MASSACHUSETTS</u>	<u>Emp.</u> -Ch. 151B, Secs. 1-10, Ann. Laws of Mass. (Michie), 1956 Supp. <u>Pub. Accom.</u> Ch. 272, Secs. 92A and 98, Ann. Laws, 1956 Supp. <u>Pub. Asst. Hsg.</u> - Ch. 151B, Ann. Laws, as amended by L.1957, Ch. 426. <u>Educ.</u> - Ch. 151C, Secs. 1-5, Ann. Laws, 1956 Supp.
<u>MICHIGAN</u>	Secs. 17.458 (1-11), Mich. Stat. Ann.
<u>MINNESOTA</u>	Secs. 363.01-363.13, Minn. Stat. Ann. (West) 1957.
<u>NEW JERSEY</u>	Sec. 18:25-1 through 18:25-28, N.J. Stat. Ann. (West) 1956, as amended by L. 1957, Ch. 66.
<u>NEW MEXICO</u>	Secs. 59-4-1 through 59-4-14, N. Mex. Stat. Ann., 1953 Compilation (1957).
<u>NEW YORK</u>	<u>Emp.</u> , <u>Pub. Accom.</u> , and <u>Pub. Asst. Hsg.</u> - Executive Law, Secs. 290-301 (McKinney) 1957. <u>Educ.</u> - Education Law, Sec. 313 (McKinney) 1957.
<u>OREGON</u>	Secs. 659.010-659.115, 659.990 (<u>Emp.</u>), 30.670-30.680 (<u>Pub. Accom.</u>), and 345.240, 345.250. (<u>Educ.</u>), Ore. Rev. Stat., as amended by L. 1957, Ch. 724 (<u>Pub. Accom. and Educ.</u>) and Ch. 725 (<u>Pub. Asst. Hsg.</u>).
<u>PENNSYLVANIA</u>	Title 43, Secs. 951-963, Pa. Stat. Ann. (Purdon) 1956.
<u>RHODE ISLAND</u>	L. 1952, Ch. 2958.
<u>WASHINGTON</u>	L. 1957, Ch. 37 (H. B. 25, approved March 2, 1957).
<u>WISCONSIN</u>	Secs. 111.31-111.36, Wisc. Stat. Ann. (West) 1957, as amended by Senate Bill No. 327 approved June 28, 1957.

APPENDIX II

STATE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AGENCIES

<u>Colorado</u>	Anti-Discrimination Commission	655 Broadway Building Denver 3, Colo.
<u>Connecticut</u>	Commission on Civil Rights	500 Capitol Avenue Hartford 15, Conn.
<u>Indiana</u>	Fair Employment Practices Commission, Division of Labor	225 State Capitol Indianapolis 4, Ind.
<u>Kansas</u>	Anti-Discrimination Commission	State Office Bldg. Topeka, Kansas
<u>Massachusetts</u>	Commission Against Discrimination	41 Tremont Street Boston 8, Mass.
<u>Michigan</u>	Fair Employment Practices Commission	900 Cadillac Square Bldg. Detroit 26, Mich.
<u>Minnesota</u>	Fair Employment Practices Commission	St. Paul 1, Minn.
<u>New Jersey</u>	Division Against Discrimination, Department of Education	1100 Raymond Blvd. Newark 5, N. J.
<u>Nex Mexico</u>	Fair Employment Practice Commission	Box 1726 Santa Fe, N. Mexico
<u>New York</u>	Commission Against Discrimination	270 Broadway New York 7, N. Y.
<u>Oregon</u>	Civil Rights Division, Bureau of Labor	State Office Bldg. Portland 1, Ore.
<u>Pennsylvania</u>	Fair Employment Practice Commission, Department of Labor and Industry	1401 Labor & Industry Bldg., Harrisburg, Pa.
<u>Rhode Island</u>	Commission Against Discrimination	Room 307, State House, Providence 2, R.I.
<u>Washington</u>	State Board Against Discrimination	3012 Arcade Building Seattle 1, Washington
<u>Wisconsin</u>	Fair Employment Practices Division, Industrial Commission	794 North Jefferson St. Milwaukee 2, Wisc.

APPENDIX III

SALIENT FEATURES OF LAWS WITH ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

TABLE A. WHO MAY COMPLAIN

	Colo.	Conn.	Mass.	Mich.	Minn.	N.J.	N.Mex.	N.Y.	Ore.	Pa.	R.I.	Wash.	Wisc.
Person aggrieved	X	X	X	X	X	X	X(1)	X	X	X	X	X	X(2)
Commission or Commissioner	X	X	X		X					X	X	X	X(2)
Attorney-General or other public official	X(3)		X(4)			X	X	X	X	X			X(2)
Private organization											X(5)		X(2)

TABLE B. ENFORCEMENT

	Colo.	Conn.	Mass.	Mich.	Minn.	N.J.	N.Mex.	N.Y.	Ore.	Pa.	R.I.	Wash.	Wisc.
Commission may issue affirmative order and obtain court enforcement	X	X	X	X	(6)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Enforcement of commission orders by other means.						X(7)				X(8)			X(9)
Statute provides that complainant may appeal from finding of no probable cause				X		X					X	X	

	Colo.:	Conn.:	Mass.:	Mich.:	Minn.:	N. J.:	N.Mex.:	N. Y.:	Ore.:	Pa.:	R.I.:	Wash.:	Wisc.:
TABLE C. SCOPE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Employment:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Government agency, employment agency, or labor organization	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Private employer (10)	6	5	6	8	8	6	4	6	6	12	4	8	1
Educational institutions	:	:	X	:	:	X(11)	:	(12)	X(13)	:	:	X(11)	(14)
Public accommodations (15)	X	X	X	:	:	X	:	X	X	:	X	X	(14)
Housing	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Public (i.e., Government owned)	:	X	X	:	:	X	:	X	:	:	X	:	(14)
Publicly assisted by	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Direct aid, such as tax exemption or land condemnation	:	X(16)	X	:	:	X	:	X	X(17)	:	:	:	(14)
Governmental guarantee of mortgage loans	:	X(16); X(18)	:	:	:	X(19)	:	X(18)	X(20)	:	:	X(19)	(14)

: Colo.: Conn.: Mass.: Mich.: Minn.: N.J. : N.Mex:N.Y.: Ore. : Pa. : R. I. : Wash.: Wisc.:

TABLE D. ACTS BANNED (21)

Discrimination (22) in
hiring, firing, promotion,
or compensation of employee.

:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X(23)	X	X	X	:
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

Refusal to list or refer
for employment.

:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	X	X	:	X	X	:	:	:	:	X	:	X	X	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

Compliance with em-
ployer's request for
discriminatory referral.

:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	X	:	:	:	X	:	:	:	:	:	:	X	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

Discrimination in member-
ship or other rights in
labor organization.

:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

Discrimination in ad-
mission to educational
institution.

:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	X	:	:	X	:	:	(12):X(13):	:	:	:	X	:	(14)
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

Discrimination in use or
enjoyment of public
accommodation.

:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	X	:	X	:	X	:	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

Discrimination in sale,
rental or privileges of
public or publicly-
assisted housing. (24)

:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	X	X	:	:	X	:	X	X	:	:	X	X(25)	(14)	:

TABLE D, (Cont'd)

:Colo.:Conn.:Mass.:Mich.:Minn.:N. J.:N.Mex.:N. Y.:Ore. :Pa. : R. I.:Wash.:Wisc.:

Discriminatory inquiry of	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
employee or applicant for employment	:	X	:	X(26)	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:
applicant for admis- sion to educational institution	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
applicant for public or publicly-assisted housing (24)	:	:	:	X	:	:	:	:	:	X	:	:	:	X(25)	:
Advertising evidencing an intent to discrim- inate by	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
employer or employ- ment agency	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:	X	:
labor organization	:	X	:	X	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	X	:	X	:
employee	:	:	:	:	:	X	:	:	:	:	:	X	:	:	:
owner or operator of public accommodation	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
owner or operator of publicly-assisted housing (24)	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

TABLE D, (Cont'd)

	: Colo.:	Conn.:	Mass.:	Mich.:	Minn.:	N. J.:	N. Mex.:	N. Y.:	Ore.:	Pa.:	R. I.:	Wash.:	Wisc.:
Discriminating against anyone for participating in enforcement proceeding.	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Aiding, inciting or compelling others to discriminate.	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Attempting to violate the statute.	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	:	X	:	(28)	X	(23)	(28)	(28)	:	(28)	X	X	:
Obstructing compliance with law or orders issued by Commission	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	:	X	:	X	X	X	X	:	X	X	X	X	:

NOTES TO APPENDIX III

1. Any person aggrieved "or any associate or person on his behalf."
2. The statute provides that "the Commission may receive and investigate complaints" but does not indicate who may be a complainant.
3. The Attorney-General is authorized to initiate complaints in employment cases but not in public accommodations cases.
4. The Attorney-General is authorized to initiate complaints in employment, public accommodations and publicly-assisted housing cases but not in education cases.
5. Complaint may be made by "an organization chartered for the purpose of combating discrimination or racism, or of safeguarding civil liberties, or of promoting full, free, or equal employment opportunities."
6. If the Commission is unable to eliminate an unfair employment practice, it notifies the governor, who appoints a board of review, which has power to issue an order enforceable in the courts.
7. The statute provides that "an order of the Commissioner may be enforced by proceedings in the County Court...." but does not indicate who is to institute the proceedings.
8. The statute provides: "The complainant, the Attorney-General or the Commission may secure enforcement of the order of the Commission...."
9. The statute provides: "Any person aggrieved by non-compliance with the order shall be entitled to have the same enforced specifically by suit in equity."
10. Numeral under each state indicates minimum number of employees necessary for application of law.
11. Educational institutions are included in the definition of public accommodations.
12. Discrimination in educational institutions is banned by the New York Education Law, which is enforced by the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Regents under a procedure similar to that followed by the state's Commission Against Discrimination. Institutions of higher learning and business and trade schools are covered by this law.
13. Applies only to vocational, professional, and trade schools.
14. Wisconsin's statute is basically a fair employment practices law but it also prohibits discrimination "in the fields of housing, recreation, education, health, and social welfare." It is not clear whether this prohibition is enforceable.

15. The list of places covered under this term varies from state to state.
16. "Public housing projects and all other forms of publicly-assisted housing" are included in the definition of public accommodations.
17. Limited to land condemned and assembled by a state agency.
18. Applies to multiple dwellings containing three or more apartments and housing projects containing ten or more homes.
19. Applies to all such housing.
20. Applies to multiple dwellings containing five or more apartments and housing projects containing six or more homes.
21. The chart shows only acts specifically prohibited by the various statutes. In other cases, the statutes may effectively prohibit specific conduct by the necessary interpretation of their terms.
22. In all cases, the conduct is prohibited if committed on the basis of "race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry" or an equivalent formula. All the laws contain provisions either permitting religious bodies to prefer their coreligionists or exempting them altogether.
23. Discrimination is banned, but only "if the individual is the best able and most competent to perform the services required."
24. For scope of application to public and publicly assisted housing, see Table C.
25. Applies also to discrimination by lending institutions in financing publicly assisted housing and to discriminatory inquiries in connection therewith.
26. Includes prohibition of discriminatory inquiries in connection with application for employee's surety bond.
27. Discriminatory questions by educational institutions are also covered since such institutions are included in the definition of public accommodations.
28. Attempts to aid, incite or compel others to violate the statute are banned but there is no specific prohibition of attempts to violate the statute itself.

APPENDIX IV
 FORMAL COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY
 AGENCIES WITH ENFORCEMENT POWERS (1)

State (2)	Number of Formal Complaints in Twelve- Month Period	1956 Population	Complaints Per 100,000 of population
Connecticut	220	2,232,000	9.86
Massachusetts	293	4,812,000	6.09
Michigan	245	7,516,000	3.26
Minnesota	29 (3)	3,241,000	0.89 (3)
New Jersey	152	5,403,000	2.81
New Mexico	10	815,000	1.23
New York	804	16,195,000	4.96
Oregon	22	1,718,000	1.28
Pennsylvania	144	10,964,000	1.31
Rhode Island	31	828,000	3.74
Washington	<u>53</u> (4)	<u>2,667,000</u>	<u>1.99</u> (4)
Total	2003	56,391,000	3.55

- (1) In comparing the number of complaints filed in the various states, it must be remembered that some agencies have much broader responsibility than others. See Appendix III, Table C.
- (2) Colorado and Wisconsin are not included because the agencies in those states have not had effective enforcement powers for a full twelve-month period.
- (3) The Minnesota figure does not include complaints arising in Minneapolis and St. Paul, due to an arrangement between the Minnesota Commission and the municipal fair employment agencies in those two cities, which have continued to operate after enactment of the state law.
- (4) Washington's complaint figure is for the calendar year of 1956. It received 74 complaints between January 1 and November 25, 1957. The increase apparently reflects the fact that its powers have enlarged during 1957.

APPENDIX V

AGENCY BUDGETS (1)

<u>State</u>	<u>1956 Population</u>	<u>Current 12-month Budget</u>	<u>Per Capita Expenditure</u>
Colorado	1,612,000	\$ 41,224	\$.0255
Connecticut	2,232,000	90,000	.0403
Massachusetts	4,812,000	87,138	.0181
Michigan	7,516,000	137,928	.0184
Minnesota	3,241,000	31,000 (2)	.0096 (2)
New Jersey	5,403,000	114,093	.0211
New Mexico	815,000	2,000	.0025
New York	16,195,000	636,668	.0393
Oregon	1,718,000	20,000	.0116
Pennsylvania	10,964,000	112,500	.0103
Rhode Island	828,000	37,495	.0453
Washington	2,667,000	39,700	.0149
Wisconsin	<u>3,764,000</u>	<u>16,480</u>	<u>.0044</u>
Total	<u>61,767,000</u>	<u>\$1,366,226</u>	<u>.0221</u>
Indiana (3)	4,413,000	\$ 30,000	.0068
Kansas	<u>2,103,000</u>	<u>15,000</u>	<u>.0071</u>
Total	<u>6,516,000</u>	<u>\$ 45,000</u>	<u>.0069</u>

- (1) In comparing the budgets and the per capita expenditures of the various states, it must be remembered that some agencies have much broader responsibility than others. See Appendix III, Table C.
- (2) See note 3 to Appendix IV for explanation of Minnesota's small case load.
- (3) Indiana and Kansas commissions have no enforcement powers.

APPENDIX VI

PROPORTION OF NEGRO, OTHER NON-WHITE, AND JEWISH POPULATION

State	Total Pop.	Negro		Other Non-White		Jewish	
	1950	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%
Colorado	1,325,089	20,177	1.52	8,259	0.62	22,500	1.70
Connecticut	2,007,280	53,472	2.66	1,479	0.07	97,500	4.86
Massachusetts	4,690,514	73,171	1.56	5,840	0.12	276,700	5.90
Michigan	6,371,766	442,296	6.94	11,645	0.18	87,800	1.38
Minnesota	2,982,483	14,022	0.47	14,764	0.50	43,500	1.46
New Jersey	4,835,329	318,565	6.59	5,179	0.11	279,400	5.78
New Mexico	681,187	8,408	1.23	42,568	6.25	1,200	0.18
New York	14,830,192	918,191	6.19	39,906	0.27	2,391,600	16.13
Oregon	1,521,341	11,529	0.76	12,684	0.83	12,000	0.79
Pennsylvania	10,498,012	638,485	6.08	5,679	0.05	365,600	3.48
Rhode Island	791,896	13,903	1.75	978	0.12	29,000	3.66
Washington	2,378,963	30,691	1.29	31,776	1.34	19,500	0.82
Wisconsin	3,434,575	28,182	0.82	13,703	0.40	42,000	1.22
Total	56,348,627	2,571,092	4.56	194,460	0.35	3,668,300	6.51
Indiana	3,934,224	174,168	4.43	1,544	0.04	39,500	0.75
Kansas	1,905,299	73,158	3.84	3,180	0.17	8,500	0.45
Total	5,839,523	247,326	4.24	4,724	0.08	38,000	0.65
Total U. S.	150,697,361	15,042,286		713,047		5,000,000	
% of Total U.S.							
in 13 States	37.39		17.09	27.27		73.37	
% of Total U.S.							
in 2 States	3.88		1.64	0.66		0.76	

(1) Jewish population figures are estimates, since the census contains no questions on religion. The figures in the table are the most widely accepted estimates.

(2) Indiana and Kansas commissions do not have enforcement powers.

